

RECEIVED

9

MR. MARSHALL: Sooner or later.

10

NOV 16 1999

Tom Marshall, Rocky Mountain Peace and

11

Justice Center.

12

The Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice

13

Center is an organization located in Boulder, Colorado.

14

We have members throughout the State of Colorado.

15

We've been around since 1983, and we will be submitting

16

formal written comments so tonight's comments are

17

preliminary in nature.

18

I probably won't speak as eloquently as

19

many of the people who have spoken tonight. There have

20

been some wonderful comments tonight. I do hope the

21

Department of Energy paid attention to those comments,

22

and they will respond to them. I hope that people who

23

have requested a response do get an adequate response,

24

and we don't see a superficial summary response going

25

to them.

y

123

1 I want to hit just some of the high points  
2 of our concern regarding the EIS. First of all, we are  
3 concerned that Yucca Mountain has been chosen because  
4 of political pressures, not based on good science.

5 If you look at the history of the  
6 selection of this site, it is clear that Nevada has  
7 been selected as the host state because it is a  
8 politically weak state. We have not have sufficient  
9 analysis of all suitable sites, or means of dealing  
10 with high-level radioactive waste.

11 Just some of the concerns that exist with  
12 Yucca Mountain at this point right now are the seismic  
13 activity and volcanic activity in the area, the  
14 presence of water in the site and the possibility for  
15 that water to remove radiation from the site in the  
16 future.

17 There are real concerns regarding  
18 environmental justice in Yucca Mountain at the Yucca  
19 Mountain site. It is considered a sacred site by a  
20 number of tribes, and the site is claimed legally by  
21 the Western Shoshone.

22 The EIS deals with this in a very odd  
23 manner. It recognizes or acknowledges the concerns of  
24 the tribes, but it doesn't actually respond to the  
25 tribes. This is something that has to change.

2

3  
continued

1                   People, all people, including the tribes  
2                   who find this land to be important and sacred, need to  
3                   be dealt with. They need to be respected. |

4

4                   The big issue for those of us in Colorado  
5                   is the issue of transportation. I would agree with  
6                   those who spoke earlier and said A, that | there should  
7                   have been better notification of this meeting, there  
8                   should have been more accurate notification and  
9                   description of this meeting, that we're not just  
10                  talking about the Yucca Mountain site but that we're  
11                  talking about transportation impacts, and B, that we  
12                  should have hearings closer to those who are impacted.  
13                  That means people along the I-70 route, not just in  
14                  Denver. There are a number of places. This is a large  
15                  state and people living up in the mountains can't  
16                  easily make it to Denver for a hearing. |

5

17                  | The most serious concern regarding the EIS  
18                  and transportation is the fact that there's no site-  
19                  specific route analysis. The conditions of the route  
20                  are not actually analyzed. So we will see truck  
21                  transportation proposed through Colorado on I-70, we  
22                  see rail transportation proposed through different  
23                  portions of Colorado, and yet we do not have an actual  
24                  analysis of those routes, and that is fundamentally  
25                  deficient.

1                   We may see according to the State of  
2 Nevada's analysis, 12,000 to 35,000 shipments coming  
3 through Colorado on I-70. That is just truck  
4 shipments, not including rail shipments. That's in  
5 addition to shipments that will be going down I-25 to  
6 the WIPP facility.

7                   Colorado is already being heavily  
8 impacted. There's 28,000 shipments going to WIPP on  
9 I-25, and now we're looking at up to 35,000 shipments  
10 over the next 39 years on the major east-west corridor  
11 through Colorado. And yet we don't have any site --  
12 any route-specific analysis. The EIS needs to be  
13 changed. It needs to include that route-specific  
14 analysis. ]

15                   [We also need an analysis of the economic  
16 impacts to Colorado and the Denver region, if there's  
17 an accident in Denver, and we need to look at the  
18 worst-case scenario in terms of an accident. ]

19                   Earlier this year at a hearing on  
20 hazardous waste transportation, the Downtown Denver  
21 Partnership testified and put out some interesting  
22 figures. There are 110,000 employees that work  
23 downtown every day coming into downtown. For special  
24 events they are looking at four million people a year  
25 coming to Coors Stadium, a million and a half going to

126

1 the Performing Arts Complex right next door here. So  
2 we need to look at the economic impacts.

3 [ We need to understand what it would take  
4 to evacuate the city if there were a major accident  
5 happening in the city limits. Those sorts of analyses  
6 need to be done for other portions of the state. ]

7 [ Tourism is a major industry in Colorado, and if  
8 you have an accident up by one of ski areas on I-70,  
9 what will be the impact to the State of that. ]

10 [ Environmental justice impacts need to be  
11 better analyzed. Somebody went into some detail  
12 earlier about the conditions of I-70 coming through  
13 Denver. Low income people, colored population are  
14 disproportionately affected by the transportation of  
15 high-level nuclear waste through Denver, and that needs  
16 to be adequately analyzed. ]

17 [ Finally, the health impacts need to be  
18 better analyzed. I asked earlier about the analyses,  
19 and whether that was just for deaths or whether it  
20 looked at incidents or adverse impacts to health other  
21 than death, and it does not. We need to better  
22 understand what would be the results to the  
23 population's health if there was a major accident in  
24 Denver. ]

25 [ I appreciate your coming to Denver to take

11 1 our comments tonight. [We at the Rocky Mountain Peace  
2 and Justice Center believe the EIS should be withdrawn,  
3 and that it should be modified in significant ways.]  
4 I've outlined some of our main concerns, and we will  
5 give you full written comments before the close of the  
6 comment period. Thanks.

7 MR. BROWN: Is there anybody else here who  
8 would like to make a comment at this time? We are  
9 scheduled to be available to accept comments through  
10 10 o'clock.

11 What we have done in the past is if nobody  
12 is prepared to make a comment at this time we will  
13 recess. If any of you here decide you would like to  
14 make a further comment, please contact me. Or if  
15 someone arrives who wishes to make a comment, I will  
16 locate them and we will reconvene for further comments.  
17 So at this point we will take a recess. I appreciate  
18 all the comments that have been made so far. Thank  
19 you.

20 (A lengthy recess was taken.)

21 MR. BROWN: We will reconvene. We have  
22 another member of the public who would like to comment.  
23 Stacey Pogue.

24 Again, if you'll introduce yourself for  
25 the court reporter, and if you have any organizational